

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated December 27, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-16 and 21-23 are withdrawn from consideration. Claim 17 is amended with this response.

In the Office Action, claims 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,310,670) in view of Toyota et al. (US 2002/0154252 A1) and Nakamura et al (US 5,245,452). Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, Toyota et al. and Nakamura et al in view of Murade et al. (US 6,489,244 B1).

The rejection of claims 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Toyota et al. and Nakamura et al is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 17 recites a method of fabricating an array substrate for an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including “and wherein forming the common electrode includes forming the common electrode to be alternatively arranged with the pixel electrode.” Applicant submits that none of the references teaches an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device or the cited feature.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the cited references do not teach each and every element of claim 17, and because no motivation other than the Applicant’s specification has been provided for modifying the teachings of Lee with Nakamura to produce the features recited in claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 17, and claim 20 depending therefrom are allowable over the cited references for at least these reasons.

The rejection of 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, Toyota et al. and Nakamura et al in view of Murade et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Murade teaches a liquid crystal display panel having a plurality of communication lines in electrical contact with the TFT substrate via contact holes. Applicant submits that Murade does not cure the deficiencies identified with respect to claim 17, and that Lee, Toyota et al., Nakamura et al., and Murade et al, analyzed singly or in combination fail to teach the features recited in claim 17. Accordingly, claim 17 is allowable over the cited references, and claims 18 and 19 are allowable at least because of their dependencies from claim 17.

Applicant believes the foregoing arguments and amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Eric J. Nuss
Registration No. 40,106

Dated: March 24, 2006

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC. 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant